

4 MAY 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Logistics, DDA
FROM: [REDACTED]
Chief, Information Management Staff, DO
SUBJECT: Copier Management Program
REFERENCE: DDA 81-0640/3, dated 9 April 1981,
Same Subject

25X1

1. We have carefully considered the cost savings and managerial efficiencies that Reference reports might derive from the consolidation of Agency copier management. We do not believe the information presented justifies the recommendation for total budget consolidation of copier funding or the establishment of a copier management program centralized in the Office of Logistics (OL). [REDACTED]

25X1

2. The Information Management Staff (IMS) centrally manages the DO's copier activity as an integral part of the DO's ongoing information and records management program. The DO does not share the problem of copier machine proliferation described in Reference. Our program provides a cost-effective system for tracking user requirements and maintenance problems and for minimizing the number of copiers through the use of better and more efficient equipment and the sharing of copiers by components. We use eight Records Management Officers assigned to our divisions and staffs and part-time of one management analyst to monitor the system and ensure flexibility in changing equipment as needs dictate and modifications are warranted in terms of cost-effectiveness and efficiency. DO philosophy on the purchase of equipment differs somewhat from Reference proposals because our operating environment is different from that of the other directorates. We rent a good portion of our copying equipment based on the need to meet continually changing requirements caused by frequent reorganizations of components and policy decisions related to emergency conditions worldwide. We have found it to be generally inefficient to provide one "standard" copier or to purchase, in lieu of renting, the bulk of our copiers. [REDACTED]

25X1

25X1
25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

3. The concept of copy centers is one that we too considered until studies showed that the centers will not meet DO requirements of cost-effectiveness, responsiveness, security, efficiency or needed proximity to users. We discarded the idea for what has proven to be a more effective copier management program of distributing copiers to locations in which studies show they are needed most and can be justified. ☐

25X1

4. The centralization of copiers would impact seriously and adversely on component efficiency and security. If copiers are centralized, we frequently would have clerks and officers waiting in line to have copies made. Centralized copiers would unfortunately facilitate a natural inclination for people to congregate and discuss their activities. This, in turn, would afford greater opportunity for the need-to-know restriction to be broken. The assertion that copy centers would effect cost savings is not supported in Reference. Savings in equipment would be offset by the number of shifts required to meet DO user needs. Moreover, information support specialists needed to staff the centers would have to come from P&PD because the DO does not have the manpower to fill the positions. We share OL's objective of reducing the proliferation of copiers and paper. To this end DO planning calls for the extensive use of electronic mail and widespread distribution of video display units which will substantially reduce, and in many cases eliminate, the use of paper and the need for copiers. ☐

25X1

5. Reference describes heavy administrative burdens caused by the large number of copier contracts and payment inquiries, and attributes delays in the contractual process to copier acquisition. It would seem reasonable to assume, however, that copiers are, in fact, only one of several factors such as staffing patterns and the purchase/rental of items such as word processors, ADP equipment, micrographic supplies, etc.; which contribute to the administrative burdens. In examining the savings projected in Reference, we would have liked to see this broken down in specific terms for the Procurement Division and by each directorate, particularly for the DO. The anticipated savings of some ☐ shown on page 6 would be offset by the addition of 1-1/2 full-time positions identified as needed by P&PD to implement Reference proposal, and we consider the estimate of 1-1/2 employees to be too conservative. In terms of savings, DO initiatives during FY 1980 resulted in a net savings in copier costs over FY 1979 even though there was an increase in the number of copies made. ☐

25X1

25X1

25X1

SUBJECT: Copier Management Program

CONCUR:



Acting Deputy Director for Operations

Date

5/5/81

25X1